

Amendment Dated 11/10/05  
Response to Office Action Dated 08/12/05

Application No. 10/009,577  
Attorney Docket No. 05222.00177

### REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending with this paper. Claims 1-19 stand rejected. Applicant is adding claim 20.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of objections to the specification and the rejections of claims 1-19 under U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicant filed a Preliminary Amendment on October 28, 2002 requesting that the title be amended to "CREATING COLLABORATIVE APPLICATION SHARING."

#### Double Patenting

Claims 1-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,822.

Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) in another paper. Applicant is requesting reconsideration of claims 1-19.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-19 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,727,950 (Cook).

Regarding claim 1, Cook does not even suggest the features of "establishing interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session" and "establishing the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." (Emphasis added.) The Office Action admits (Page 5, section 5.):

Cook does not explicitly teach establishing interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session and establishing the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters. However, interaction parameters for the plurality of users are just the number of users participated in the collaborative session.

Amendment Dated 11/10/05  
Response to Office Action Dated 08/12/05

Application No. 10/009,577  
Attorney Docket No. 105222.00177

The Office Action alleges that there is a prior art teaching in which one can determine the number of users by observing the collaborative session after the establishment of the network connection. However, the combination of the alleged teaching and Cook does not even suggest the feature of "establishing the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." (Emphasis added.) Moreover, the alleged teaching does not teach anything about the number of users being based on the destination of the collaborative training session. The combination of the alleged teaching and Cook does not even suggest anything about interaction parameters that are based on the destination of the collaborative training session and thus fails to suggest the feature of "establishing interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session." (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 10 includes the features of "logic that establishes interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session" and "logic that establishes the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." Also, independent claim 11 includes the features of "a code segment that establishes interaction parameters for the plurality of users based on a destination of the collaborative training session" and "a code segment that establishes the network connection mode between the plurality of users in accordance with the interaction parameters." Moreover, claims 2-9 and 12-19 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 11 and are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-19.

#### New Claim

Applicant is adding claim 20, which is supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, the present patent application discloses (Page 222, lines 4-14. Emphasis added.):

Amendment Dated 11/10/05  
Response to Office Action Dated 08/12/05

Application No. 10/009,577  
Attorney Docket No. 105222.00177


A decision is made at decision block 97200 to decide if the traveler desires to enter into a project room. Then, as shown in FIG. 97B, at function block 9720 a user can view a listing of all the people that are active in the project and perform directory functions such as those discussed with reference to FIG. 90. Function block 97220 allows a traveler to review artifacts such as project deliverables, presentations and other materials. Then, at function block 97230 a traveler can add artifacts, or edit artifacts as shown in function block 97240 and control is passed via label A 97001. An artifact can be deleted at function block 97250 and collaboration is performed at function block 97260 as detailed in FIG. 90. Function block 97270 processes newsgroups such as threads associated with a topic of interest to the traveler and function block 97280 processes discussion groups such as an interactive chat session or collaboration concerning a point of interest with multiple participants. Finally control is returned via label A 97001.

### Conclusions

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 10, 2005



Kenneth F. Smolik  
Registration No. 44,344  
BANNER & WITCOFF, L.P.  
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 1000  
Chicago, IL 60606-7407  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001